

**NESENOFF &  
MILTENBERG**  
LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

nmllplaw.com

Ira S. Nesenoff  
Andrew T. Miltenberg  
Stuart Bernstein

Barbara H. Trapasso  
Tara J. Davis  
Diana R. Warshow  
Gabrielle M. Vinci  
Kara L. Gorycki  
Cindy A. Singh  
Nicholas E. Lewis  
Adrienne D. Levy  
Ryaan Nizam  
Regina M. Federico

Philip A. Byler  
*Senior Litigation Counsel*  
Rebecca C. Nunberg  
*Counsel*  
Jeffrey S. Berkowitz  
*Counsel*  
Marybeth Sydor  
*Title IX Consultant*

January 31, 2020

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

The Chambers of the Honorable Judge LaShann DeArcy Hall  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of New York  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn, New York 11201

**Re: *Elliott v. Donegan, et al.*; Case No. 1: 18-cv-05680-LDH-SJB**

Dear Judge DeArcy Hall,

We represent Stephen Elliott (“Plaintiff”) in the above-referenced matter and submit this letter to respectfully request clarification as to the Court’s Scheduling Order docket entry, dated January 29, 2020 (“Scheduling Order”). In the Scheduling Order, pertaining to Defendant Donegan’s Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Complaint (Docket No. 40, the “Motion to Dismiss”) the Court directs, “Oral argument on the issue of Plaintiff’s status as a limited-purpose public figure shall be held on February 7, 2020...” Respectfully, and out of an excess of caution, Plaintiff writes Your Honor simply to confirm that the oral argument scheduled for February 7 will be on all issues pertaining to Plaintiff’s alleged status as a limited-purpose public figure—e.g., if Plaintiff was a limited-purpose public figure, has Plaintiff adequately alleged actual malice?—and not only the single issue of whether Plaintiff was or was not a limited-purpose public figure. In addition, Plaintiff respectfully writes to confirm that oral argument will not be heard on issues not pertaining to Plaintiff’s status as a limited-purpose public figure, such as immunity under Section 230 of the CDA.

If Plaintiff is mistaken in either of these conclusions, Plaintiff apologizes to the Court and respectfully requests clarification. If the Court would prefer a brief phone conference with the parties, the undersigned would be happy to coordinate with all counsel at a time convenient for the Court, on Monday afternoon or another time thereafter. We thank Your Honor for the Court’s continued guidance and consideration in this matter

**Very truly yours,**  
**NESENOFF & MILTENBERG, LLP**

**By: /s/ Andrew T. Miltenberg**  
**Andrew Miltenberg, Esq.**

CC: All Counsel (Via ECF)